DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 973 EA 010 476

AUTHOR Abramowitz, Susan
TITLE High School Bureaucracy: A Myth Exposed.
PUB DATE Mar 78
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Asscciation (Toronto, Ontario, March 27-31, 1978); Table 2 may not reproduce clearly due to small print

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; *Bureaucracy; Decision Making; Differentiated Staffs; Discipline Policy; Educational Research; Evaluation; *High School Organization; *National Surveys; Organization; Organizational Communication; *Organizational Theories; Participation; *Principals; Role Perception; Secondary Education; Teacher Administrator Relationship

ABSTRACT

The National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Institute of Education surveyed a national stratified random sample of 2,000 high school principals (75 percent response rate) to determine the nature of high school structure. Six structural (role, rules, differentiation, authority, decision-making participation, formal communication) and two coordination (evaluation and interdependence) variables were investigated. The results show only isolated relationships, mainly due to increased complexity. For example, staffing differentiation is associated with decision-making participation, the number of people evaluating teachers, and formal communication through meetings. These findings are in part tautological since much of the variance can be explained by the presence of a varied faculty and staff. Since few of the variables were related, the author concludes that high schools cannot be described by a unitary factor such as bureaucracy. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151973

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HIGH SCHOOL BUREAUCRACY: A MYTH EXPOSED

Susan Abramowitz

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Susan Abramowitz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

SCHOOL FINANCE AND ORGANIZATION DIVISION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

EA 010 476

Not for distribution or quotation

A paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of The American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada, March 1978

HIGH SCHOOL BUREAUCRACY: A MYTH EXPOSED

Susan Abramowitz
The National Institute of Education

Over the past five years policy analysts have grown concerned with the apparent inability of many high schools to educate their students effectively. Critics contend that high schools are bureaucratic institutions, staffed with authoritarian teachers and housing alienated students. In order to test these assumptions, the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Institute of Education surveyed a national stratified random sample of 2000 high school principals (75 percent response rate) to determine the nature of high school structure.

Six structural (role, rules, differentiation, authority, decision-making participation, formal communication) and two coordination (evaluation and interdependence) variables were investigated. The results show only isolated relationships, mainly due to increased complexity. For example, staffing differentiation is associated with decision-making participation, the number of people evaluating teachers and formal communication through meetings. These findings are in part tautological since much of the variance can be explained by the presence of a varied faculty and staff. Since few of the variables were related, the author concludes that high schools cannot be described by a unitary factor such as bureaucracy. While much goes on in high schools, it is unclear that one type of event is at all related to other types of occurances.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past five years policy analysts have grown concerned with the apparent inability of many high schools to educate their students effectively. Critics contend that high schools are bureaucratic institutions, staffed with authoritarian teachers and housing alienated students (Coleman, 1974; Brown, 1973; Martin, 1974). The word "bureaucracy," which once connoted a set of attributes characteristic of an ideal and maximally efficient organization - a functional division of labor, a definition of staff roles as offices, a hierarichical ordering of offices, and a well-defined set of rules governing organizational maintenance and operation - has acquired a pejorative cast. The image of the high school as a bureaucratic institution, stemming from Waller's research in the 1930's (Waller, 1932), is reinforced by anecdotal reports prevalent in the sixties, and only partially mitigated by Bidwell's and others' recent observation that professionalism counteracts many bureaucratic tendencies in high schools (Bidwell, 1965).

There are two problems, however, with the application of the standard bureaucratic model to school organization: it is overly reliant on work done on other types of organizations (i.e., industrial and public service organizations), and it is relatively uninformed by systematic data. Neither problem is surprising, given that actual large-scale research on high schools is virtually non-existent.

A new body of literature suggests that educational institutions might be better characterized either by the absence of structural ties between components of the organization or by loose linkages in some areas and tight ones in others. Although these new models of loosely coupled systems are similarly based on scarce data, they are nevertheless provocative, much more so in their very antithesis to the traditional bureaucratic view. Contrary to viewing activity in schools as reflecting that represented in a recognizable organizational chart, these models suggest that groups of participants within school systems are only loosely connected one with another. One model suggests that the mix of problems and situations at any given point in time, competing demands on participants' time and attention, and "the mix of solutions looking for problems" all determine to a great extent how decisions are made and components are linked in a particular school (Cohen and March, 1974; Cohen, March and Olsen, 1972; March and Olsen, 1976; Weiner, 1972). Another group of theorists suggests that the purpose of formal structure is to legitimate an organization in the eyes of its clients and suppliers of resources rather than coordinate or control internal activity (Meyer and Rowan, 1976). In fact, were a school to try to use formal structure to control internal activity, inconsistencies between structural tenets and organizational activity might be uncovered, thus threatening institutional legitimacy.

The aim of this study is to investigate the structure and management of the nation's high schools with an eye toward uncovering actual patterns of coupling in schools. We can thereby assess the appli-

cability of the bureaucratic model and the accuracy of predictions made by other models of school organization.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

We are investigating the applicability of two different models as descriptors of high school structure. One model draws on conventional bureaucratic theories while the other is more institutional in scope.

Conventional Theories

Conventional theories posit that the function of organizational structure is to coordinate the goals and activities of an institution. For example, these theories predict that as the staffing structure becomes more differentiated - as there is a proliferation of functionaries with their own responsibilities or areas of concern - more complex mechanisms are needed to insure the smooth functioning of the parts of the whole. Under certain circumstances participants supply their own coordination mechanisms, freeing the formal structure from the necessity of becoming too complex. This is likely to occur in organizations with a large number of professionals (Aiken and Hage, 1967). Nonetheless, conventional theorists predict staffing differentiation will produce an increase in complexity of coordination mechanisms within an organization.

The literature is somewhat ambiguous about the relationships among the facets of formal structure. Hall in his review of the literature found that increases in vertical or horizontal differentiation resulted in a lower reliance on the centralization of authority and rules formalization (Hall 1972). In their work in welfare agencies, Aiken and Hage (1967) found that greater differentiation as measured by specialists required less centralization of decision-making and less use of rules. Since the organizations they were investigating were staffed predominantly by professionals, their findings should be applicable to schools.

There have even been several studies examining structural relationships in schools. In his study of elementary schools, Punch uncovered two orthogonal factors. One contained measures of hierarchy of authority, rules, procedural specifications and impersonality, while the other measured specialization and technical competence (Punch 1969). Building on Punch's work, Isherwood administered the School Organizational Inventory to teachers in thirteen schools in New Jersey. The results of an unrotated factor loading indicate that hierarchy, rules, procedures and impersonality are all positively correlated to this factor while division of labor and technical competence are negatively related to it. In fact the correlation between the control factor and division of labor/technical competence factor was -.77 (Isherwood, 1972). Bishop surveyed 615 secondary school teachers with a questionnaire based on Hage's work and found three independent factors: (1) degree of centralization, a factor measuring hierarchy of authority and degree of decision making participation; (2) degree of formalization, a factor containing role specificity and rule observation; and (3) degree of complexity as measured by professional training.

While such studies support the notion that high schools possess attributes of a bureaucracy, the results may be dependent on the nature of the measures used which are somewhat more appropriate for industrial firms than schools. For example, the division of labor in schools usually bears little resemblance to an industrial or corporate division of labor. Promotion in schools is not based on technical competence, given a fairly flat hierarchy and almost universally guaranteed tenure. Yet variables such as these were used in the studies described above.

Institutional Theory

This theory postulates that the education system generally may be better characterized as consisting of loosely connected units rather than tightly bound components of a hierarchical organization. According to a group of Stanford researchers, the organization of districts, schools and classrooms does not conform to the traditional view of an "organization in which goals, rules, and roles govern the nature of activity" (Meyer, etc. 1976). Rather, the structure conforms more to a "partial organization", consisting of segmented, decentralized units, in which the higher organizational levels do not bureaucratically control or coordinate the main activity (instruction) of the lower levels.

This notion is supported by the observation that there is little agreement between superintendents and principals, principals in the same district, principals and teachers in the same school, and teachers within schools on what the district's or school's common policies and practices are (Meyer, 1976); Likert and Siepert, 1973). When one examines the nature

of influence within districts and schools, principals report that the district office is not a powerful presence, that they themselves have influence within their schools but that most decisions are made in consultation with teachers rather than independently, and that they defer to teachers on decisions related to the matter and substance of instruction (Deal, et. al., 1974).

Within this framework the formal structure has little effect on the actual activity, or on practical control and coordination processes within the school. Theoretically, if the administration were actually to implement many of the innovations or practices which the formal structure incorporates, school managers would find that actual activity and practice did not conform to the expectations of the larger community. This would put principals in a bind either with their faculty or with the outside world To protect themselves from such a dilemma, very little investigation, evaluation, or observation of actual behavior occurs whiles forms attesting to these occurances are filled out and returned to the district office (Davis & Stackhouse, 1977).

High Schools and Theory

Given these two models, which more aptly describes the nature of high school organization and management? There is no dearth of contentions to support the notion that schools in general and high schools especially can be aptly described as formal organizations or less affectionately as bureaucracies.

Critics contend and observation confirms that schools possess at least some characteristics applicable to a bureaucratic model - a functional division of labor, a definition of staff roles as "offices", a hierarchial ordering of offices, and organizational maintenance and operation governed by a well-defined set of rules. Teachers are usually subject-matter specialists responsible for instructional activities; principals are,by and large, in charge of business and overall management (except with complex technology). To qualify for particular positions, candidates must meet a specified set of criteria. For the system to run smoothly and "rationally", certain rules are established to govern behavior and movement within the school (e.g., dress codes, work schedules, batch processing of students who move from class to class at preset intervals, etc.), and throughout the district (e.g., policies concerning graduation requirements, innovation, length and composition of the school day, etc.). In many schools, physical structure reinforces the impression of a bureaucratic structure. Long corridors connect similar enclosures, each containing a few dozen young persons with one adult. The arrangement of furniture bespeaks each occupant's role and status--one large desk faces many smaller ones.

Furthermore, some critics suggest that within this bureaucratic setting, teaching is often hampered by the necessity to control students. This view reflects a long-standing school of thought that contends that high school teachers are confronted in the classroom with a miniature student society. Students are involuntary

clients who lack intrinsic motivation and must be closely controlled. Conscripted to attend school, they are considered alienated from their school tasks. Teachers are locked into "offices" and power struggles with unwilling or rebellious young clients. The school must, through its organizational arrangements, contain the adversary relationship between the student culture and the teacher (Waller, 1932; Gordon, 1957; Coleman, 1961, 1974; Cook, 1945; Bidwell, 1965).

Although at first blush there appears to be substantial support for the notion of tight coupling between the administration and coordination and control processes, some research suggests that this is most likely to occur in non-instructional areas. Although much of the rhetoric in the last ten years has centered on the rigidity of institutions due to the unimaginative use of and strict adherence to rules and regulations, there is some support for the notion that rules serve useful functions in bureaucracies. Moeller, in his 1964 research on the relationship between rules and teacher attitudes in junior high schools, found that teachers in schools having more, clearly understood, and uniformly enforced rules were less likely to be alienated, and much more likely to have a stronger sense of autonomy. In an investigation of elementary schools conducted in 1972, Goodwin found that teachers were more favorably disposed toward parents, students, the principal, reform, and parental participation in schools with a high level of formal rules governing discipline matters.

In schools with few rules for discipline, teachers felt isolated and uncertain as to the limits of their authority. In addition, Goodwin found that when the organization attempted to regulate instruction, teacher attitudes toward the school were negative.

Conventional theory also postulates that schools are so structurally entrenched that the probability of internal reform is extremely low. One reason for this low propensity for change is due in large part to subject matter specialization. High school teachers seem to believe that their first priority is coverage of topics in their discipline (National Education Association). They do not welcome innovations that, in effect, redefine their teaching role. As Berman and McLaughlin report (1975), in commenting on the success of federally sponsored-change agent programs:

> Indifferent and unreceptive environments were frequent in our sample of projects attempted in secondary schools. Change agent projects that included the higher grade levels experienced severe management and administrative problems as well as teacher resistance. For example, Right-to-Read projects consistently encountered resistance at the high school level as they attempted to persuade science or history teachers to view themselves as teachers of reading. The same thing happened with career education projects. Project managers could generate little interest in new ideas among secondary school teachers of solid subjects who perceived themselves as having large intellectual and emotional investments in academic purity. In short, this tendency toward strict professionalism among secondary school teachers (along with the compartmentalization of the curriculum and classroom scheduling) may not have provided the organizational conditions necessary for significant change efforts.

When reform was curricular, however, rather than structural, high schools have successfully embraced new ways. Most principals of large schools report that they had been involved in tryouts of experimental foreign language, mathematics, and national science curricula (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1965). Accelerated programs in science and mathematics, programmed instruction, and team teaching were also reported. (And the larger the high schools, the more likely the presence of such innovations).

The high school curriculum reforms inaugurated in the 1960s have been widely adopted, since they had the advantage of being subject-matter specific. Science teachers learned the new biology or the new chemistry, but were not required to learn material outside their fields of expertise. Those curricula that entailed subject-matter overlap or an interdisciplinary orientation met with strikingly less success.

With respect to implementing new organizational arrangements, high schools have made some significant changes. As a review of practitioner literature indicates, creating subschool units, changing ecological arrangements (e.g., providing student meeting and study areas, etc.) and redefining participant roles (e.g., faculty assume counseling responsibilities, etc.) are examples of changes reported by practitioners (Hartman 1975; Crabtree 1975; Marland 1975; Johnston and Parker 1975; Moseley 1972; Gorman 1972; Tanner 1972; Weber 1972; and Schoenholtz 1972).

Certainly conventional wisdom and public policy pronouncements persuade one that high schools are more like bureaucracies than any other type of organization, a proposition this study has determined to investigate.

Structural Variables Under Investigation

This paper reports the results of a study investigating the nature of school structure.[1] We have chosen to describe the formal structure of an organization by using the following six structural variables: roles members assume, staffing patterns, principal authority, the presence of formal rules, decision-making participation, and the channels of communications. Below are descriptions of each variable and their operationalized measures.

Role Perception One dimension of structure describes the way in which members of an organization perceive their roles. We are interested in whether principals see their role as managerial, as a senior colleague to teachers, or as a good will ambassador to the community. The first would suggest a more bureaucratic perception; the second a more professional role, and the third, a role where relating to parent and student concerns are important. In addition, we are interested in the breadth of the principal's role. If one principal conceives his/her role broadly (i.e., as doing all the above), then there may be trade-offs in the extent to which he/she has time left to attend any one issue. We are using the following variables to measure principal role:

Manager A Guttman scale measuring the percent of principals who say the following activities are very important to them: enforcing school rules and policies, managing the day-to-day operation of the school, and coordinating with the district office.

1 The sample consisted of 2000 public schools stratified by four regions of the country and three levels of urbanism (urban, rural and suburban). Within each strata schools were selected with probabilities proportional to school enrollment. The response rate was 72 percent.

Colleague A Guttman scale measuring the percent of principals who say the following such activities are important to them: working with teachers closely on instructions, involving numerous people in decision making, and allowing teachers to teach according to their personal preference.

Ambassador An additive index of principals who say relating personally with parents and the community and/or students is very important.

Principal Activity An additive index of principals who say the following items are very important: working closely with teachers on instruction, allowing teachers to instruct according to their personal preference, enforcing school rules and policies, involving numerous people in school decision making, managing the day to day operation of the school, coordinating with the district office, relating personally with students; and relating personally with parents and community.

Authority We are also interested in the principal's role within the school district: whether the principal believes s/he has significant discretion to direct the school, or whether the role perceived is more like that of a middle manager who must frequently defer to district-level authority. Authority is gauged with a Guttman scale measuring the extent to which a principal believes he has authority, relative to the central office, to determin his school's total budget, to allocate school budget funds among departments within the school, and to fill teacher vacancies.

Staffing Differentiation Staffing differentiation describes the segmentation of the organization--vertically and horizontally--into distinct components. Vertical differentiation is indicated by the presence of a hierarchy of authority. The more levels there are, and the more clearly they are adhered to in practice, the greater the degree of vertical differentiation in schools. The more prevalent the hierarchy of authority, the more centralized the authority of the organization is considered.

Horizontal differentiation refers to the way in which tasks are divided among members of similar office or function; i.e., among teachers, or among specialists. The division of a school into subject matter departments, or into subunits, is also indicative of horizontal differentiation. The more departments, or the more different kinds of specialists, the more horizontally differentiated the school. Schools that are more highly differentiated vertically and horizontally are considered more organizationally complex.

Organizational complexity within the school will be measured by doing several indicators of differentiation: number of adults; (number using aides and volunteers); number of specialists (number of counselors, librarians and special education people); number of departments; number of assistant administrators; number of standing committees; number of ad hoc committees.

Rules We define this aspect of structure as the extent to which rules exist in a school. Specifically we investigate three different kinds of rules:

Student Rules The extent to which the school has the following student rules - no smoking, hall passes, closed campus for student lunch, student responsibility for paying for damaged school property, and dress codes.

Teacher Rules The extent to which the school has the following teacher rules - giving homework, inviting an outside speaker into class; frequency of testing; controlling disruptive students; and dealing with parental complaints.

School Rules The extent to which the school has established the following rules - adding a new academic course; setting rules for student behavior; determining course objectives; setting conditions for early exit/early graduation; adopting a new school grading practice; setting criteria for evaluating teacher performance; setting criteria for evaluating principal performances, allocating school budget funds among departments, teachers, or activities.

Decision-making Participation The degree to which participation in decision-making on matters that affect the whole school is centralized constitutes another indicator of structure. Generally, decision-making participation is characterized as centralized when the principal makes most decisions with relatively little participation by various individuals and groups within the school.

We measure the breadth of decision-making participation by counting how many of the following issues - teacher selection, adding a new academic course, adopting rules for student behavior, determining course objectives, evaluating the school's grading practices, formulating school goals and developing a school budget - the following people or groups of people

participate in: Principal, Teachers, Counselors, School Administrators, (Principals and Assistant Principals), The Whole School (Principal, Teachers, Assistant Administrators and Counselors), District Administrators, School Clients, Teacher Organizations (as measured by the presence or absence of their participation on each issue).

Formal Communication The extensiveness of formal communication through regular meetings constitutes our last dimension of structure. We are interested in how extensively principals use faculty meetings, administrative staff meetings, and parent advisory groups in the operation of the school. An elaborate and broadbased formal communication network would indicate structural complexity. The extensiveness of formal communications by meetings is measured by noting the frequency with which the following types of meetings occur: regular school meetings, district meetings and meetings with parents.

Collegial Coordination

The several aspects of the organization's structure are held together by certain coordination processes. The two coordination mechanisms we focus on are collegial interdependence and evaluation.

Interdependence. Because the relationships between faculty and administrators and among the staff depend on the nature of the task, we focus on the relationships centering around instruction. Basically, we wish to determine the degree to which teachers directly interact with each other and with administrators to provide an educational program. For example, teachers may behave autonomously and independently, each rendering a discrete contribution to a child's education ("pooled" interdependence).

Or teachers might relate to each other sequentially, much as in an ordinary high school where students progress from eleventh and twelfth grade English. In this case, although teachers have some students in common, contact among teachers is usually limited. A third variant is the situation in which teachers have a reciprocal relationship with each other, sharing the same students or classes (Thomson, 1967). Extensive teacher teaming or the presence of interdisciplinary courses suggest a high level of teacher interdependence in the school. We use the following two variables to measure teacher task interdependence:

> Teaming the proportion of courses which are team taught (in which two or more teachers jointly plan and teach a course to a given group of students).
>
> Interdisciplinary course the proportion of courses which are interdisciplinary or interdepartmental.

Evaluation. Dornbusch and Scott (1975) describe evaluation as having four facets: (1) allocation of tasks; (2) the setting of evaluation criteria; (3) sampling behavior of the evaluatee; and (4) appraising performance. Given that the first two are fairly standardized (Lortie, 1969; Corwin, 1974; Meyer and Rowan, 1975, 1976) we investigate the latter two only. Schools in which teachers remain relatively isolated within their classrooms with infrequent or irregular principal or peer evaluation are likely to differ markedly from schools in which evaluation is regularly used. In the former case, research suggests that the organization has little effect on teacher behavior (Meyer, Cohen, et. al., 1971) and could thus be characterized as having simple (or no) forms of coordination and control.

We use the following measures to ascertain the extensiveness of evaluation mechanisms in the school after teachers complete their probationary period:

Frequency of teacher evaluation - measures how frequently teachers receive a formal evaluation.

Frequency of principal evaluation - measures the frequency with which principals are evaluated.

Breadth of participation in teacher evaluation - measures the variety of people (e.g., principal, assistant principal, department heads, peers, students, and parents) who participate in the formal evaluation of teachers.

Breadth of participation in principal evaluation - measures the variety of people (e.g., school board, superintendent, central office or area administrators, principal, and school staff) who participate in the formal evaluation of principals.

Frequency of observation - this measures the extensiveness of face-to-face evaluation by noting how frequently the principal personally observes in classrooms.

RESULTS

Measure Reliability

Before examining how the structural variables are related to each other, the within-measure Kendall correlations are worth examining (see Table 1). In all but two cases (rules and evaluation) the items are reasonably associated with each other.

Roles. The different aspects of principal role are highly correlated with each other, suggesting that principals seldom see themselves as conforming to just one role. Moreover, principal activity, both within and without the school, seems to capture all and more of what we were trying to measure through our three different role variables. Thus, it seems to matter less which particular role a principal plays, than the number of different issues to which he/she attends.

Differentiation. The correlations of the differentiation variables indicate that staffing patterns get complex in many different ways almost simultaneously. Even the number of committees, whether ad hoc or standing, proliferate in schools with a range of different kinds of staff. These results are not just an artifact of school size as the relationships between the various differentiation variables still hold up when the effect of size is partialed out.

Rules. Although the presence of rules for teachers and students seems to be modestly related, this is not so for school rules governing larger academic and management issues. The use of these broader rules, then, seems to be independent of formalisms directed toward students and teachers.

Participation. Involving a range of participants in school decision-making seems to be a singular dimension of school structure. If there is decision-making participation in high schools, a breadth of school level actors are involved. Most everybody who is anybody seems to be involved in this process. With the exception of teacher organizations, participation by any one set of school actors tends to be consistently related to the participation of others. The index measuring total school participation (this includes principals, assistant administrators, counselors and teachers) captures the strength of these relationships best. These findings deserve a caveat, since they are somewhat tautological. Most of the variance in decision-making participation can be explained by whether or not the school has these different types of people around.

Formal Communication. If meetings occur on a frequent basis (once a month or more) they are just as likely to occur among district staff, school administrators, and parents. Meeting frequently, then, seems to be a general characteristic of some schools as is the non-use of meetings as a mode of formal communication.

Evaluation. The items measuring different aspects of evaluation do not hang together as well as our other sets of variables. For some reason, there appears to be a domino effect: if principals are evaluated frequently, teachers tend to get similar treatment. Likewise, if a lot of people are involved in evaluating the principal (district level people, for the most part), many people at the high school level are involved in evaluating the teacher. Yet none of these variables are related at all to whether or not the principal observes the teacher in the classroom.

Correlations Among the Structure Variables

Contrary to bureaucratic notions of high school structure, our results indicate that very few of our structural variables are interrelated. The role a principal adopts, the presence or absence of rules concerning student and teacher behavior and school governance issues, the nature of the principal's authority, evaluation structures and staff interdependence are virtually unrelated to each other. The only common threads among this set of variables have to do with decision-making participation and school staffing patterns.

Differentiation. Several different things go on in schools with complex staffing patterns. First increased differentiation means that there are more types of people to participate in decision-making, the primary groups with increased participation being clients and school administrators.

The breadth of staffing patterns is also related to the nature of the evaluation system. In highly complex schools more people participate in teacher evaluation. However, the frequency with which the teacher actually gets evaluated decreases, providing an obvious example of loose coupling in schools.

Differentiation is also positively related to the amount of team teaching which goes on in high schools. Evidently, having many people around who fill different functions increases the likelihood that teachers will find someone to share in classroom teaching. This relationship, however, disappers when size is held constant, a result that may be an artifact of response bias or a comment about life in large schools.

Last, more people in special categories are apparently associated with the need for meetings to coordinate what is going on. We find there to be an overall increase in administrative meetings as staff specialization increases. Furthermore..the number of parent meetings also increases. The findings support the notion that one function of a broad gauged faculty is to enable certain staff to spend time dealing with parent concerns.

Participation. Increased participation in school decision-making, like increased differentiation, seems to be related to most of our structural variables, but not as strongly nor as consistently. The strongest relationship is between decision-making participation and principal authority vis a vis the school district.

These findings suggest that power is not a zero sum game. If the principal has standing within the wider circle of district management then there is potential for his/her staff to benefit from his enhanced status through broader participation in the school decision-making process.

Access to decision-making may be a mixed blessing since it is associated with increased participation in what appears to be ritualistic activity - evaluating teachers and attending meetings. This seems to hold especially for assistant administrators.

By way of summary, increased complexity seems to be related to the following structural variables:

- o broader participation in decision making
- o more people evaluating teachers but less frequent evaluation
- o more team teaching in larger schools
- o more formal communication through meetings, particularly administrative staff and parent meetings

In addition to its association with differentiation, decision-making participation on the part of administrators and client groups is positively related to principal authority, participation in teacher evaluation and the frequency of administrative staff meetings.

CONCLUSION

If high schools could be characterized as bureaucratic, the variables examined would have been highly correlated. For example, schools with complex staffing patterns would also be expected to have extensive rule structures. We might also have seen in highly differentiated settings a great deal of personnel evaluation as a mechanism to monitor teacher performance.

However, our results are quite different: there are few substantial correlations among our variables; and those that exist are really isolated relationships. The survey data yield no one factor summarizing the nature of high school organization and management and therefore, nothing to support the notion that bureaucracy is a unitary construct as applied to high schools.

The isolated relationships we uncover center mostly around a school's staffing patterns. On one hand these are robust relationships since they remain in tact when the effects due to size are removed (Table 2). Regardless of school size, differentiation in faculty and staff is associated with more "things" going on (i.e., meetings, evaluation, participation). On the other hand, however, these results are partly tautological. If the school doesn't have an array of people filling specialized positions, then it is obviously impossible for such people to participate in decision-making and attend meetings.

It appears, then, that much is happening in high schools, but that one set of occurances may be unrelated to another set. While faculty and staff are involved in meetings and decision-making, it is unclear whether their involvement affects the course of events. Involvement

may be far more important than actual outcomes. We then conclude that notions of loose coupling are more appropriate descriptors of high school organization than those of bureaucracy. Until we go back to the schools to survey faculty and student impressions we are left with this impression.

Further research will also address the limitations of a broad first survey. While we may be unable to uncover bureaucracy as reported by the principal, we may find it when we ask students and teachers to describe school structure and management.

Ironically, problems critics ascribe to bureaucracy are just as likely to occur in a loosely coupled world. When components within the school are not linked to each other, a problem is just as likely to go unsolved due to unconnectedness as to bureaucratic inflexibility.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bailey, L., The 12th Grade: A Critical Year, National Association of Secondary School Principals, Reston, Virginia, 1975.

Baldridge, J.V. and T.E. Deal, Managing Change in Educational Organizations, McCutchany, San Francisco, California, 1975.

Barker, R.G. and P.V. Gump, Big School, Small School: High School Size and Student Behavior, Stanford University Press, 1964.

Berman, P., and M. W. McLaughlin, Federal Program Supporting Educational Change, 5 Vol., The Rand Corporation, R-1589-HEW, 1975.

Bidw ell, C.E., "The School as a Formal Organization", in J.G. March (ed.), Handbook of Organizations, Rand McNally and Co., Chicago, Illinois 1969, pp. 972-1022.

Bishop, Lloyd K., Julius R. Goerge, "Organizational Structure: A Factor Analysis of Structural Characteristics of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, Educational Administration Quarterly, 9:3, 66-79 (Autum), 1973.

Blau, P.M. and R.A. Schoenherr, The Structure of Organizations, Basic Books, New York, 1971.

Brown, N.F. et al., The Reform of Secondary Education: A Report to the Public and the Profession, National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1973.

Cohen, M.D. and March, J.G., Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President, Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1974.

Cohen, M.D., March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P., "A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice," Administrative Science Quaterly, March, 1972.

Cohn, E., "Economy of Scale in Iowa School Operations," Journal of Human Resources, Fall 1968, pp. 422-434.

Coleman, J.A., The Adolescent Society: The Social Life of the Teenager and Its Impact on Education, Free Press, New York, 1961.

Coleman, J.A. et al., Youth: Transition to Adulthood, Report of the Panel as Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee, University of Chicago Press, Illinois, 1974.

Conant, J.B., The Comprehensive High School, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967.

Cook, L.A., "An Experimental Sociographic Study of A Stratified 10th Grade Class," American Sociological Review, Vol. lo, 1945, pp. 250-261.

Corwin, R.G., "Models of Educational Organizations," Review of Research in Education, 1974

Deal, T.E., Meyer, J.W. and Scott, W.R., "Organizational Support for Innovative Instructional Programs: District and School Levels," Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1974.

Dornbusch, S.M. and Scott, W.R., Evaluation and The Exercise of Authority, Jossey-Bass, 1975

Dreeben, R., "The School as Workplace," in R.M.W. Travers (ed.), Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, Rand McNally and Co., Chicago, Illinois, 1973.

Gittell, M., Participants and Participation, Praeger, New York, 1967.

Gittell, M. and Hollander, T.E., Sit Urban School Districts, Praeger, New York, 1968.

Goodwin, David, "School Bureaucracy and Political Conflict," paper presented at American Education Research Association conference, 1976

Gordon, C.W., The Social System of the High School, Free Press, New York 1957.

Hage, J. and M. Aiken, "Relationship of Centralization to Other Structural Properties," Administrative Science Quarterly, 12: 72-92, 1967.

Hall, R.H., Organizations: Structure and Process, Prentice-Hale, Inc., Englewood Clifs, New Jersey, 1972.

Ishemood, Geoffrey B. and Wayne K. Koy, "Bureaucratic Structure Reconsidered, Journal of Experimental Education (Vol. 41, November 1, Fall, 1972.

Hounin, J., Discipline and Group Management in Classroom, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1970.

Lawrence, P.R. and Lorsch, J.W., Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1967.

Likert, Rensis and Siepert, Albert F., "The Likert School Profile Measurements of Human Organization," paper, AERA Convention, February, 1973.

Lortie, D.C., "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching," in A. Etzioni, ed., The Semi-Professions and Their Organization, Free Press, 1969.

March, J.G. and J.P. Olsen, Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations, Bergen: Universitetsforlaget, 1976.

Martin, J.H. et al., National Panel on High School and Adolescent Education, Washington, D.C., March, 1974.

Mayeski, G.W., et al., A Study of Our Nation's Schools, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Publication (OE), 72-142, 1972.

Mayeski, G.W., et al., A Study of Attitude Toward Life of Our Nation's Students, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Publication (OE), 73-01700, 1973.

Meyer, J.W. and E. Cohen, The Impact of the Open-Space and Autonomy: The Effects on an Organizational Innovation. Technical report 21, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1971.

Meyer, J.W., and B. Rowan, "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony," American Journal of Sociology, September, 1977.

Meyers, Russel W., "Bureaucratic Theory and Schools" Administrators Notebook, Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, Vol XX, Jan 1972, No. 5.

Mintzberg, H., The Nature of Managerial Work, Harper and Row, 1973

Moeller, G.H. "Bureaucracy and Teachers' Sense of Power," School Review, 72(1964), pp. 137-157.

National Education Association, Status of the American Public School Teacher, 1970-71, Research Report, 1972-Rs, Washington, D.C., 1972

National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972: National Center for Education Statistics, No. 75-208, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1975.

Punch, Keith F., "Bureaucratic Structure in SChools: Toward Redefinition and Measurement, Education Administration Quarterly, 5:43-57, Spring, 1969.

Walker, D.F. and J. Schaffarzick, "Comparing Curricula," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 44, No. 1, Winter, 1974.

Waller, W.W., The Sociology of Teaching, Wiley and Sons, New York, 1932.

Weiner, S.S., Educational Decisions in an Organizational Anarchy, unpublished PH.D. thesis, Stanford University, 1972.

Partial Correlations of Structural Variables Holding Size Constant

TABLE II

	Roles				Rules			Participation							Differentiation						Evaluation				INT		Meetings			Auth	Size
	M	C	Act	Am	S	T	M	P	T	SD	Scl	SA	C	SS	DT	I	A	#S	#D	#AA	#SC	#AH	FT	FP	FTO	#PT	#PP	I	TM	S	D	P	A	
Roles																																	
manager	14		72	23	13	11	-03	-02	-04	11	-05	-09	03	-07	-01		-09	-05	-02	-04	-05	-07	02	02	-06	-03	05	05	-06	-03	02	-03	-07	-06
colleague			65	19	-08	00	02	01	06	02	10	11	12	13	06		05	06	07	08	07	10	05	09	03	07	07	06	08	13	03	06	06	06
active				65	04	08	-02	00	01	08	05	01	10	04	02		-03	03	04	04	02	01	03	06	-02	04	08	06	00	07	04	05	-02	-00
ambassador					02	05	-04	02	01	02	06	02	04	03	-01		-01	06	04	05	03	01	-00	02	-00	06	04	-07	00	06	03	08	-03	-00
Rules																																	
Student						23	-06	01	-02	12	-03	-03	06	-00	-00		-10	-05	03	-03	01	-03	06	-04	01	-07	02	03	09	-07	-04	-06	-04	02
Teacher							-03	04	-04	06	11	16	09	13	04		08	15	14	15	12	10	05	06	11	14	01	05	06	10	-01	14	05	20
management								08	11	03	13	17	09	18	00		10	03	11	08	06	07	-01	02	-04	09	04	-02	04	05	01	04	05	06
Participation																																	
Principal									33	24	25	30	26	52	-00		02	02	09	00	03	08	02	03	10	08	05	-05	06	00	05	-06	32	05
Teacher										19	43	23	40	58	-01		03	-01	00	-07	05	10	-06	01	07	08	10	-03	10	03	02	-01	22	-06
Sum District											26	19	27	29	10		-02	04	05	-04	03	02	06	05	03	15	15	-01	-03	01	02	02	-01	00
Sum Client												36	45	52	22		13	20	07	16	18	18	-04	12	07	23	21	01	06	15	01	19	10	16
Sum Adm													34	88	11		29	44	43	43	30	32	-09	12	13	49	10	-10	07	27	02	14	26	52
Counselors														64	45		03	06	04	-01	11	11	03	04	05	12	13	00	02	03	04	01	16	04
Sum School															11		22	32	31	27	25	28	-07	10	14	40	14	-08	09	20	03	09	33	35
D Teacher Org																	07	12	02	07	08	03	-01	02	-01	07	05	00	-00	02	01	05	-04	09
Differentiation																																	
Adults																		37	21	35	24	24	-08	09	08	27	08	-06	08	20	04	29	09	37
#specialists																			34	67	31	27	-15	11	06	41	09	-10	03	26	-04	26	10	62
#departments																				38	25	24	-14	12	08	27	04	-09	03	13	-03	14	15	46
#ass't adm																					29	28	-13	14	03	38	03	-12	04	25	-05	26	09	72
#																						40	-10	09	05	24	02	-05	05	19	-06	16	07	31
#Ad hoc com																							-05	10	10	22	05	-06	04	20	02	13	15	27
Evaluation																																	
freq teacher eval																								20	09	-04	02	13	03	04	10	-02	-01	-19
freq princ eval																									09	10	20	04	04	23	08	13	08	13
freq teacher obs																										04	03	-04	04	13	02	03	04	07
# people eval teach																											27	-01	08	23	-03	19	09	41
# people eval princ																												06	06	08	00	06	06	00
Interdependence																																	
interdiscipl																													05	-00	04	-01	-07	-13
teaming																														09	01	02	09	01
Meetings																																	
school																															18	21	11	26
district																																15	15	-07
parent																																	02	24
Authority																																		12

TABLE I

	ROLES				Rules			Participation							Differentiation							Evaluation					Inter		Meetings		
	M	C	Ac	Am	S	T	H	P	T	SD	SQ	SSA	C	SS	DTO	A	#S	#D	#AA	#SC	#AH	A	FTE	FPE	FTO	#TE	#PE	IRT DIS	TM	S	D	P
Roles																															
manager	-	12	63	20	12	10	-06	00	-01	09	-04	-06	01	-04	-02	-06	-07	-00	-06	-04	-09	-03	05	02	-02	-03	04	-01	-07	-01	02	-03
collegue		-	56	17	-09	02	02	06	06	02	09	09	09	10	05	03	05	06	08	06	08	06	04	10	04	07	08	07	07	11	04	06
active			-	53	01	08	-03	04	03	05	03	02	06	04	00	-01	-00	04	02	02	-01	00	05	07	00	04	08	03	01	06	05	04
ambassador				-	02	06	-02	04	01	01	05	03	03	03	00	01	05	04	04	04	00	-03	02	03	-00	07	08	-00	02	04	04	08
Rules																																
Souant					-	.18	-04	02	-01	08	-04	-01	05	00	-02	-08	-03	-01	-02	00	-02	-02	08	-00	03	-03	-01	-03	-05	-04	-01	-06
Teacher						-	-02	06	-04	04	09	11	06	08	03	08	12	08	14	11	10	02	05	08	08	11	01	04	03	08	00	09
Management							-	10	10	03	09	12	08	14	01	04	03	09	05	03	-03	05	01	01	03	05	02	02	06	04	02	02
Participation																																
Principal								-	28	20	23	26	23	41	-01	06	08	08	10	06	10	33	03	07	10	10	06	-02	08	04	01	-08
Teacher									-	12	36	17	31	43	-00	04	-02	-00	-04	04	08	18	- 02	02	07	03	10	-01	08	02	-00	-01
Sum District										-	16	12	18	18	08	-02	04	02	02	-02	01	00	05	06	03	09	14	-00	-01	00	00	-01
Sum Client											-	26	34	38	20	12	14	05	14	15	17	07	- 01	09	07	07	20	05	14	08	01	12
Sum Adm												-	25	73	10	22	38	31	48	24	27	20	- 08	09	09	40	09	-01	18	16	-02	09
Counselors													-	48	15	04	07	03	03	10	11	11	03	04	04	06	06	02	04	01	02	-01
Sum school														-	10	17	28	23	32	20	24	24	- 05	08	10	31	09	-01	16	12	-00	05
D Teacher Org															-	04	05	01	06	08	05	04	- 00	04	00	07	01	03	01	02	-01	03
Differentiation																																
Adults																-	38	16	28	17	20	12	-09	08	06	19	07	02	16	13	05	18
# specialists																	-	36	61	26	24	08	- 13	10	06	36	04	-01	15	20	-03	20
# departments																		-	39	21	19	09	- 15	08	07	22	03	-00	17	09	-04	11
# ass't adm'																			-	27	27	.11	- 17	12	03	43	03	-02	15	22	-08	22
# standing com																					35	06	- 06	09	04	21	03	02	13	15	-05	14
# ad hoc comm																					-	12	- 06	08	08	24	04	02	15	14	-00	11
Authority																							- 00	08	03	06	07	-01	11	08	13	01
Evaluation																																
freq teacher eval																							-	17	09	-06	02	06	-04	04	19	-04
freq principal eval																								-	07	04	17	04	07	17	07	11
freq teacher obs																									-	10	01	-03	05	10	03	02
# people eval tcher																											19	02	15	17	-05	14
# people eval princ																												07	06	05	04	04
Interdependence																																
Interdisciplincary																														02	01	06
teaming																														11	00	06
Meetings																																
Schl																														-	13	26
district																															-	11
parent																																